

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 have been cancelled, without prejudice. Claims 10 and 11 have been added.

Claim 10 combines the features of previous claims 1-8 and adds an additional feature, namely, that the photopolymerizable monomer (component (D)) is selected from the group consisting of diacrylates of polyethylene glycol, dimethacrylates of polyethylene glycol, diacrylates of polypropylene glycol and diamethacrylates of polypropylene glycol.

The photopolymerizable monomer component was a feature of original claim 8 and the diacrylates and dimethacrylates of polyethylene and polypropylene glycols are disclosed, for example, at page 17, lines 6-8, of the instant specification. Thus, claim 10 is fully supported by the application as filed and no new matter has been added.

Claim 11 is identical to canceled claim 9, but now refers to claim 10. No new matter has been added.

The following remarks respond to the similarly numbered paragraphs of the Action mailed 4/17/2003.

1. Applicant appreciates the cooperation of the Examiner in promptly reviewing the Official Action (Paper No. 7) mailed on 4/3/2003, noting the incomplete Office Action Summary and re-starting the response period by re-mailing the Action on 4/17/2003. No substantive issues were discussed in the telephone call of April 15, 2003. Applicant's representative had merely noted that the Office Action Summary received with Paper No. 7 stated that the Action was non-final but that none of the other blanks or boxes were checked.

3. Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter applicant regards as the invention. As has been noted above, claims 1-9 were canceled, without prejudice, herein and new claims 10-11 have been presented. Claim 10 has all of the features of claims 1-8 and has been worded, to overcome this rejection, as suggested by the Examiner's comments. Thus, it is urged that this rejection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

6. Claims 1-7 were rejected under Section 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Faust et al. (4,245,030). The rejection is respectfully traversed. In addition, claims 1-9 have been cancelled as was previously noted. It is noted that claim 8 was not rejected here under Section 102(b) and that its features have now been incorporated into new claim 10. In addition, specific photopolymerizable monomers which are described in the specification, but did not previously specifically appear in the canceled claims, are now recited in claim 10. It is urged, therefore, that this rejection has been overcome and should be withdrawn. Claims 10-11 are not anticipated by the reference. Nor would the claims have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made over Faust et al.

7. Claims 1-8 were rejected under Section 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Faust et al. (4,245,030). The rejection is respectfully traversed. As has been noted, claims 1-9 have been cancelled and new claims 10-11 added. Claim 10 has all the features of previous claims 1-8 and adds an additional feature, namely, that the photopolymerizable monomer is to be selected from diacrylates and dimethacrylates of polyethylene glycol and diacrylates and dimethacrylates of polypropylene glycol. It is urged that the cited reference does not disclose or suggest the pending claims. It is also urged that the claimed invention would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art over the cited reference at the time the invention was made. The rejection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

8. Claim 9 was rejected under Section 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Faust et al. (4,245,030) and further in view of Celeste (3,469,982). The rejection is respectfully traversed. As has been noted, claims 1-9 have been cancelled and new claims 10-11 added. Claim 10 has all the features of previous claims 1-8 and adds an additional feature, namely, that the photopolymerizable monomer is to be selected from diacrylates and dimethacrylates of polyethylene glycol and diacrylates and dimethacrylates of polypropylene glycol. It is urged that the cited references do not disclose or suggest the pending claims. It is also urged that the

claimed invention would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art over the cited references, either when taken alone or in combination, at the time the invention was made.

Claim 11 is identical to claim 9, except that it refers back to claim 10 instead. Since claim 11 refers back to claim 10, which now has the added feature mentioned above, applicant urges that it is patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 10 is patentable. It would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art over the cited references at the time the claimed invention was made. The rejection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

9. Claims 1-4 and 7-9 were rejected under Section 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Takehana et al (EP 0 741 332). The rejection is respectfully traversed. As has been noted, claims 1-9 have been cancelled and new claims 10-11 added. Claim 10 has all the features of previous claims 1-8 and adds an additional feature, namely, that the photopolymerizable monomer is to be selected from diacrylates and dimethacrylates of polyethylene glycol and diacrylates and dimethacrylates of polypropylene glycol. It is urged that the cited reference does not disclose or suggest the pending claims. It is also urged that the claimed invention would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art over the cited reference at the time the invention was made.

It is noted that claims 5-6 were not rejected over this reference. The features of those claims have been included in new claim 10; for this additional reason, the pending claims are urged to be allowable. The rejection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

10. Claims 1-9 were rejected under Section 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Obiye et al. (EP 0 770 923). The rejection is respectfully traversed. As has been noted, claims 1-9 have been cancelled and new claims 10-11 added. Claim 10 has all the features of previous claims 1-8 and adds an additional feature, namely, that the photopolymerizable monomer is to be selected from diacrylates and dimethacrylates of polyethylene glycol and diacrylates and dimethacrylates of polypropylene glycol. It is urged that the cited reference does not disclose or suggest the pending claims. It is also urged that the claimed invention would not have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art over the cited reference at the time the invention was made. The rejection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

11. Claims 1 and 5-9 were rejected under Section 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Iwasaki et al. (4,629,680). The rejection is respectfully traversed. As has been noted, claims 1-9 have been cancelled and new claims 10-11 added. Claim 10 has all the features of previous claims 1-8 and adds an additional feature, namely, that the photopolymerizable monomer is to be selected from diacrylates and dimethacrylates of polyethylene glycol and diacrylates and dimethacrylates of polypropylene glycol. It is urged that the cited reference does not disclose or suggest the pending claims. It is also urged that the claimed invention would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art over the cited reference at the time the invention was made.

It is noted that claims 2-4 were not rejected over this reference. The features of those claims have been included in new claim 10; for this additional reason, the pending claims are urged to be allowable. The rejection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

12. Claim 1 was rejected under either Section 102(b) or, in the alternative, Section 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Iwasaki et al. (4,925,768). The rejection is respectfully traversed. As has been noted, claims 1-9 have been cancelled and new claims 10-11 added. Claim 10 has all the features of previous claims 1-8 and adds an additional feature, namely, that the photopolymerizable monomer is to be selected from diacrylates and dimethacrylates of polyethylene glycol and diacrylates and dimethacrylates of polypropylene glycol. It is urged that the cited reference does not disclose or suggest the pending claims. It is also urged that the claimed invention would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art over the cited reference at the time the invention was made.

It is noted that claims 2-8 were not rejected over this reference. The features of those claims have been included in new claim 10; for this additional reason, the pending claims are urged to be allowable. The rejection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Applicant : Kumazawa et al.
Serial No. : 09/993,090
Filed : November 6, 2001
Page : 8 of 8

Attorney's Docket No.: 10891-009001 / T2A-
138124C/YKY

Conclusion

Prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance is appropriate and is urged.

Enclosed is a \$410 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/17/2003

Richard P. Ferrara

Richard P. Ferrara
Reg. No. 30,632

Fish & Richardson P.C.
45 Rockefeller Plaza, Suite 2800
New York, New York 10111
Telephone: (212) 765-5070
Facsimile: (212) 258-2291